

CITY COUNCIL, CITY OF LODI
COUNCIL CHAMBER, CITY HALL
AUGUST 13, 1958

This regularly adjourned meeting of the City Council of the City of Lodi held beginning at 8:00 o'clock p.m. of Wednesday, August 13, 1958; Councilmen Culbertson, Mitchell, Robinson, and Katzakian (Mayor) present; Brown absent. Also present: City Manager Graves, Planning Director Rodgers, Administrative Assistant Brown and Director of Public Works A. C. Heckenlaible.

Councilman Brown and City Attorney Mullen arrived at approximately 8:05 and 8:10 respectively.

STORM
DRAINAGE
PLAN

At the invitation of the Mayor, Mr. Heckenlaible explained the City's present drainage system, the plan proposed by Wilsey and Ham, and his proposal for modifying the Wilsey and Ham plan and retaining the City's present system of draining into the Mokelumne River. Mr. Heckenlaible estimated that his plan would save the City approximately \$300,000 over the Wilsey and Ham proposal; however, the level of drainage would not be as high as that proposed by Wilsey and Ham which is on the basis of a ten-year storm. Councilmen Brown and Robinson questioned the use of an open ditch, stating it would be difficult to obtain rights of way, maintenance costs would be high, and the City would be subject to damage claims. It was pointed out that costs of installing and maintaining pipe lines would be more expensive and the plan was to obtain rights of way along section lines. It was stated that no further use of the Woodbridge Irrigation District canal beyond the 85 cubic feet per second presently allowed could be hoped for. The City Manager stated that three decisions would have to be made by the Council as follows: (1) The level of drainage desired, (2) the method of disposal and (3) whether or not to use the plan recommended by the Director of Public Works. Mr. Heckenlaible stated that his proposal would take care of twice as much storm waters in the downtown area as the present system. It was noted that the Wilsey and Ham proposal covered an area of 6000 acres which is larger than the Master Plan which covers 4200 acres. Further discussion was held over to the meeting on August 20.

PUC
HEARING

The City Manager reported that the Public Utilities Commission was to conduct a hearing on Investigation on the Commission's own motion concerning the Proper Treatment for Rate-Fixing Purposes, to be accorded Accelerated Amortization and Accelerated Depreciation. He stated that the Northern California Municipal Electric Association was to file as an interested party and suggested that the City could file as an interested party also, but that there was no need to file as a protestant. The City Attorney recommended that the Attorney General's office be commended for its investigation of the matter. Councilman Robinson felt it unnecessary for the City to take a stand on the matter. The Mayor requested that the City Manager and City Attorney keep the Council informed of the proceedings.

SUBDIVISION
ORDINANCE

The Mayor opened the meeting to further consideration of the proposed Subdivision Ordinance. The Planning Director presented the following list of improvements for subdivisions: grading, oiling, curb and gutter, sidewalk, final paving, street signs, water, fire protection, sanitary sewer, storm drainage, electricity and street lights. On motion of Councilman Mitchell, Robinson second, the Council determined that all the improvements listed should be required. Councilman Robinson moved that the developer do the grading, oiling, curb and gutter, sidewalk and street lights and the City do the final paving, street signs, water, and fire protection, sanitary sewer, storm drainage and electricity and that all the improvements were to be paid by the subdivider on an equitable basis. The motion was seconded by Councilman Mitchell and passed by the following vote:

AYES: Councilmen - Culbertson, Mitchell and Robinson

NOES: Councilmen - Brown and Katzakian

Council members expressed their understanding that the cost of installation of electric utilities would be refunded to the subdivider as is the present policy.

It was noted that the proposed ordinance had a minimum lot requirement of 50 feet. On motion of Councilman Culbertson, Mitchell second, the Council eliminated the 50-foot requirement by deleting the words "except that in no case shall the lot width be less than 50 feet" from subsection 4.41 of the proposed ordinance.

The Council adjourned on motion of Councilman Culbertson, Robinson second.

Beatrice Caribaldi
ATTEST: BEATRICE CARIBALDI
City Clerk